



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







THE CHURCH'S CLAIM
AND
ARCHDEACON DENISON'S RESOLUTION
COMPARED.

A LETTER
TO THE
LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD
ON THE
PRESENT STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY
CONCERNING
THE MANAGEMENT CLAUSES
OF THE
COMMITTEE OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

BY THE
REV. ROBERT A. GORDON,
RECTOR OF AVINGTON, BERKS,
AND AN INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS IN THE DIOCESE OF OXFORD.

OXFORD,
JOHN HENRY PARKER;
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

M DCCC LII.

141. C. 57.



MY DEAR LORD,

I THINK it a fact worthy of notice in the present divided state of opinion on the points on which the Committee of the National Society, and the Committee of the Privy Council are still at variance, that the whole body of School Inspectors of your Lordship's diocese should have been of one mind as to the position which the Church ought to maintain in her controversy with the State, on the questions at issue between them. I take this unanimity as a sign that there is a practical view of these questions, in which the majority of Churchmen interested in the great subject of National education may be expected to agree. For the twenty-three clergymen who formed the Meeting at your Lordship's palace at Cuddesdon were not representatives of any particular school within the Church, nor were they drawn together by common views on a controverted question. They were men appointed to their office on account of their practical interest in the education of the children of the Church, and were gathered

from every part of the diocese to discuss its present state and the means by which it might be advanced in their own districts. Though differing, I believe, on many points on which Churchmen do differ overmuch in the present day, they were yet essentially of one mind on the much vexed question of the forms of management imposed by the Committee of Council on founders of Church schools aided by their grants.

I am not, my Lord, led to be less hopeful that a somewhat similar unanimity may be possible among Churchmen generally, by the disapproval with which the resolution in which we were unanimous has been received by many, who I believe are at one with us on all essential points of principle. For I feel that our position has been very imperfectly understood. We have been misrepresented by some as if we were simply opposing that particular form of school management which vests its control in the clergyman solely, or as desiring to yield the right of its adoption at the dictation of the Privy Council, rather than as advocating a course by which we hoped that harmonious co-operation with the State might be attained, whilst every principle was fully maintained, and the interests of Church education effectually secured.

I believe, my Lord, that there is such a course open to us at the present time. The claim which Archdeacon Denison proposes to call on the National Society to assert at its next general meeting,

I believe to be a barrier to its attainment. It was with this feeling, that the body of Inspectors were unanimous in a resolution which condemned it; and that a similar resolution was subsequently adopted by a large majority of the Board of Education of the diocese.

But the claim in question, that the Committee of Council should assist with a building grant such founders of schools as refuse to adopt any other form of management than that vested in the clergyman solely, has so long been put forward as the point on which the whole controversy turns, that those who decline to press it are considered by many to be conceding the principle at issue. I believe, that many, who regret that the refusal of the Committee of Council to yield this claim should be urged as the especial grievance of the Church in the arbitrary enforcement of the management clauses, would yet think themselves bound as a point of principle to join in its assertion.

I am therefore very anxious to invite consideration to the question, what is the point of principle really at issue between the Church, and the State as represented by the late Committee of Privy Council? For my own part, I believe, that the principle which the Church is bound to maintain, is neither fairly represented, nor fully included, in the claim which Archdeacon Denison proposes to call upon the National Society to assert at its next General Meeting. The claim of the

Church is something larger and broader than this, and yet if calmly and temperately maintained, would, I think, be more fairly considered and more readily conceded, than the particular demand which has been so vehemently urged.

Now the point of principle which appears to me to be really at issue between the Government and the Church, is this ; that it does not belong to the Committee of Privy Council to determine arbitrarily what form of school management shall be adopted. The question between Archdeacon Denison, and the Oxford Inspectors and Educational Board, is not whether the Government should be allowed to dictate arbitrarily to the Church as to the way in which her schools should be managed, but how such dictation may best be resisted.

It must of course be conceded, that a body entrusted with the distribution of public money for a particular purpose, is not only justified in requiring, but bound to require, of those to whom a money-grant is made, the observance of certain conditions which shall secure its proper application to the purposes for which it was voted by Parliament.

It cannot be expected, or wished, that the Committee of Council should make building grants towards the erection of schools which have not been duly conveyed to proper trustees, or whose trust-deeds contain either no provision for their management, or one manifestly bad, as affording no proper security for their effective supervision. I can con-

ceive no course more injurious to the interests of Church education than this. The most decided opponents of the present management clause system admit that the Committee of Council may fairly require that every body of school founders to whom they make a grant, should lay before them "a proper trust-deed affording fair and reasonable security that good and sufficient Church education shall be given." If this be granted, and no more accurate rule be laid down, there is necessarily conceded to the Committee of Council the right of rejecting those applicants whose proposed management clauses do not appear to them to afford such reasonable security.

Now the only protection against the arbitrary exercise of this power is some definite arrangement as to what forms of management shall be accepted by the Committee of Council as satisfactory. If this point be left for particular discussion between the Committee of Council and every body of school founders who desire their aid, the interests of the Church would be exposed to considerable danger, when the members of the Committee might happen to be either hostile or indifferent to the objects she desires to secure. It is certain that very many promoters of schools would deliberately prefer the adoption of a management clause which they felt to afford insufficient security for the preservation of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, (in the hope that possible ills

might never really occur,) if such were the only means by which they could obtain a school, rather than endure the present evils consequent on the want of one. Many also, from carelessness and inexperience in such matters, would frame for themselves trust-deeds so defective and faulty, that their adoption, if permitted, would leave the school with far less provision for the due influence of the clergyman, or the satisfactory character of the master, than is afforded by any of the management clauses of the Privy Council. I suppose the experience of most persons practically conversant with the subject could furnish instances where the legal management, which accidentally resulted from the character of a school trust-deed which had no management clause, was very much more objectionable than that provided by clauses A, B, C, D, of the late Committee of Council in their worst form. And the examination of the old trust-deeds of Church schools, from which it appeared that out of 17,000 only 4,500 were properly secured, has shewn how prevalent is the most extreme carelessness in this respect.

In a somewhat healthier state of discipline than exists at present, and with more of mutual confidence between the State and the Church, we might indeed have expected, that the Government would have been content to rely on the authorities of the Church, that sufficient provision should be made for securing in perpetuity the satisfactory

character of the education given in schools aided by it. Building grants might then have been made to promoters of Church schools on the recommendation of the diocesan of the particular case, and the approval of the trust-deeds of the building by the Committee of the National Society, without any interference on the part of the Privy Council Committee with the wishes of the founders. According to this plan the Church would have been left to arrange for the education of her own people in her own way, which would have been most fully in accordance with the principles on which the grant in aid of National education was voted by Parliament. The duty of the Committee of Council would then have been limited to providing that the amount given to each particular body of founders should be regulated by that which was raised by them. This course would undoubtedly have been the most thoroughly satisfactory to the Church generally, and most in accordance with the principles which should regulate the relations of Church and State.

But I do not think that the Church could claim this as a right, or expect its adoption under present circumstances, by a body taking a very active interest in the education of the country generally. It was known that the National Society did not profess to exercise any supervision over the forms of management, which founders of Church schools aided by their grants thought it right to adopt, and

that no provision was made by them (such as that afforded by reserving the right of authoritative inspection) for ascertaining that the education given in schools built in part by their grants was efficient. And therefore it cannot be thought to be unreasonable that the Committee of Council should consider some additional security necessary, beyond the sanction of the trust-deed by the National Society, for securing the efficient character of the management proposed by local founders. The principle of this claim of the Committee of Privy Council to enforce conditions on school founders, for the purpose of securing that the education given should be in their judgment satisfactory, was fully conceded some years ago, when submission to a system of State inspection was acquiesced in as an invariable rule in all schools aided by them.

We must therefore be content to acquiesce in the Committee of Council having some voice in the determination of the forms of management which shall be adopted by founders of Church schools receiving a building grant from Government. And I do not think this an intolerable evil. I would rather hope that its result may be on the whole practically good. For I think it quite possible that an arrangement might be made, by which several forms of management clauses should be agreed upon as sufficient in the judgment of the Privy Council, and thoroughly satisfactory to the Church, among which each body of school founders might choose

freely. And from time to time new forms might be added, or variations of the established forms allowed, in order to adapt them to peculiar circumstances at the desire of the school founders, with the recommendation of their diocesan, and with the approval of the National Society.

But another and more difficult question is then opened. What kind of clause or clauses, in the trust-deeds of schools, should be considered by the Committee of Privy Council as affording sufficient provision for their efficient management? This is a question which I think can only be fairly settled by conference and agreement between the Committee of the Privy Council on the one hand, and the Church on the other. The State will not leave this matter in the hands of the Church. The Church cannot leave it in the hands of the State. She cannot grant to the State the right to determine absolutely the particular way in which the schools for the education of her poor shall be managed without resigning what is a part of her proper province and duty. And further, the Committee of the Privy Council cannot legally claim this right. For when on their own authority they draw up and enforce on the founders of Church schools certain forms of management, without the approval or sanction of the Church, as expressed by her recognised societies, they exceed their proper power, which is a power of simply dispensing a money grant according to a definite rule laid down by Parliament, and

not of legislating as to the terms on which it should be given.

But it has been said that the Church cannot, consistently with her principles, allow *any* interference on the part of the State, with the forms of management which shall be adopted in her schools, and that therefore, if certain forms are to be definitely settled for adoption in Church schools, aided by grants from Government, they must be drawn up by the Church and accepted by the State, without modification or exception. It is argued, that to submit to any limitation imposed by the Committee of Council on founders of Church schools beyond the requirement that the forms of management adopted by them shall have received the sanction of the Church, is to concede the great principle that the Church cannot, in a point of this kind, submit to State dictation.

I do not think that this can be maintained. When the Church asks aid from the public funds for the education of her members, it surely involves no concession of principle to agree to certain terms as the condition of a grant, provided that the terms agreed upon are thoroughly consistent with the maintenance of her doctrine and discipline, and with the fullest security for the religious and moral training of her children. To maintain the absolute liberty of promoters of Church schools to adopt *every* form of management which has the sanction of the Church is assuredly not a point of principle.

It is perfectly compatible with the maintenance of all essential liberty for the Church to agree with the State, that in carrying out a joint object she will act in a certain way, if such action is accordant with her own principles. Such agreement necessarily involves a certain loss of absolute liberty. Every agreement between two independent bodies must have this effect. But, if no principle is conceded, and the accomplishment of her own great objects, and the security of those interests she is bound to guard, are by such a course more effectually attained, it is not only lawful, but most right to adopt it. All alliance with the State necessarily involves a loss of absolute liberty,—and that to a great extent,—yet such alliance has ever been held to be strictly in harmony with Church principle. It is not therefore a sufficient ground for absolutely refusing to acquiesce in the enforcement of a particular condition by the Privy Council on founders of schools aided by them, that it is a restriction upon liberty which ordinarily they might justly have enjoyed. Before it can be fairly maintained that such a course is the only safe one, it must be shewn that the condition is injurious to the interests of the Church, or inconsistent with her principles.

We seem then to be driven to adopt some management clause system as a most necessary and valuable protection to the interests of Church education under present circumstances. And if, as I think all practical men will admit, we cannot

claim as a right that the State should accept *all* the forms of management, which have had the sanction of the Church, there is no other course open than that of a kind of concordat on the subject between the Church and the State. This necessarily implies the cession, in more or less degree, of absolute and unrestricted liberty, but not of the least point of principle, or of any safeguard important to the interests of her people. The great principle on which the Church ought to insist in any such arrangement, and on which she has a right to insist, is this, that no founders of a Church school should be required, as the condition of their obtaining a building grant from the Committee of Council, to adopt any form of management which does not in her judgment afford the fullest security for the preservation of her doctrine and discipline, and the due education of her children.

This is the Church's just claim, which ought, I think, to be maintained by all her members ;—that the founders of her schools, receiving building grants from the State, should not be restrained from the adoption of such forms of management, or from the insertion in their trust-deeds of such provisions, as she shall deem to be essential, or important, in securing the sound religious education of her children *on her own principles*.

This is, as I have said, a claim far larger and broader than that which has been urged by Arch-deacon Denison for a particular liberty on a point

of very doubtful advantage. And yet I have no doubt it will be far more readily conceded. For it appeals directly to the principles by which such questions should be tried. It appeals to the existing law of the land, which has decreed that every religious body should be assisted by the national funds, in proportion to their own exertions in the work, in the education on their own principles of their own people. It appeals to that older and higher law which has decreed immutably that the Church shall have this right and may not concede it.

The amount of liberty, which would be possessed by the promoters of Church schools if this claim were granted, would be amply sufficient and ought to be satisfactory. The Church cannot claim for every body of school founders liberty to follow the chance leading of their own views and prejudices in a matter of this kind. She ought not to desire that it should be possessed by them. For the insertion of a particular form of management clause in the trust-deeds of a parochial school will affect the interests of the Church and her people in that parish so long as the present state of things shall endure,—possibly for ages. It must be legally a provision for perpetuity.

That this has been too much forgotten is plain from the way in which the claim for the absolute liberty of particular founders has been urged. It has been stated again and again as a most striking in-

stance of the injustice of the restriction from adopting that form of management, which vests the entire control of the school in the clergyman solely, that when the whole body of promoters have been laymen, and have with one voice desired it, it has been still refused. There might have been some force in this argument if the provision of the trust-deed were for that generation only, but as it must affect the interests of the parish and of the Church in perpetuity, it should not be absolutely determined by the wishes of the immediate promoters of the school. For my own part, I think that there is no case where less hardship could be inflicted, or where there would be less real interference with the wishes of any existing class of school founders. And it is the only case where it is quite certain that for one generation at least no practical evil would follow from the enforcement of the condition, that some lay members of the Church should be joined with the clergyman in the management of the school. For the lay promoters of the school, if invested by the trust-deed with a share in the management, could of course leave it during their own life-time, or so long as they thought fit, as absolutely in the hands of the clergyman, as if they had no such power. They would have been simply prevented from depriving themselves and their successors of a right, or rather of divesting themselves of the responsibility, of interfering under altered circumstances, when it might be of the utmost consequence to the interests of the

Church and parish that they should be able to do this.

The Church and the State may then well act in harmony, and with much benefit to the interests of Church education, on this point of the enforcement of a satisfactory management clause on all school founders. There is no necessary opposition between them as to the general character of the forms which may be considered as satisfactory. And the harmonious adoption of certain forms for insertion in trust-deeds of schools aided by public money might be expected to result from a fair and temperate discussion of the subject.

If the Church were allowed to act as a body corporate, and to express her mind on this as on other subjects in her legitimate Synod, there would be no difficulty as to the way in which some such arrangement might be made. In default, however, of any more legitimate and satisfactory mode in which the Church may come to some determination on the subject, we may, I think, be content to be represented in this respect by the National Society, and the terms made between its Committee and the Committee of Council, if accepted by the Society at large, may fairly be considered to have received Church sanction.

But it appears that one of the points, which the Committee of the Privy Council hold to be essential to a satisfactory school management, is, that it should not be vested in perpetuity in the clergyman

of the parish *solely*, but that some lay members of the Church should be joined with him. It is to this condition that the strongest objection has been raised by those who have been considered as specially maintaining the claims of the Church, as one which we are bound on principle to oppose. Yet, if it be, as I have maintained, lawful for the Church to acquiesce in some restriction on her liberty, it is clearly not a point of principle to resist this condition, unless we hold that it is at variance with the theory or practice of the Church, or inconsistent with a satisfactory provision for the due training and education of her children. Can this be maintained with reference to this condition? I think not. No one, I believe, has asserted that it is contrary to the theory or practice of the Church, that some of her lay members should be joined with the clergyman in the formal management of a parochial school. And though a mixed Committee might in some circumstances seriously interfere with the satisfactory conduct of a school, to which unity of principle, and a firm definite authority are essential, yet I think it cannot be maintained, that such a form of management is necessarily inconsistent with the fullest provision for the sound religious training and education of the children, and the preservation of the Church's doctrine and discipline. Ordinarily the Committee of Management would not interfere with the conduct of the parochial school, but leave it to those to whose office its care and superintendence

especially belong. And plainly, there are circumstances in which it might be of the utmost importance to a school, that some others besides the clergyman of the parish should be invested by the trust-deed with some responsibility for its satisfactory state, and some authority to superintend it. If the management be by trust-deed vested in the clergyman solely, and this position of sole management should be occupied by one having no kind of interest in the state of the school, the school having no supervision would ordinarily soon become worthless for its purpose. Those whose assistance would be most valuable would rarely like to interfere in a matter in which they were legally excluded from all authority. But the evil arising from circumstances like these would be much diminished, if the trust-deed contained a different form of management clause. I am practically acquainted with the very great value of assistance and superintendence secured to a school by some of the laity having been legally invested with the right to take a part in its management. The right becomes a duty in cases of necessity, and calls forth exertions to supply, what otherwise would have remained unsupplied, some superintendence and care for a school, when the parochial clergyman is utterly indifferent about it.

I am not, my Lord, arguing in favour of the imposition of a restriction on the founders of Church schools, which should preclude them from vesting

their management solely in the clergyman of the parish. But I think it right that the reasons on which the Government so resolutely maintain the enforcement of this restriction should be considered. If this restriction were imposed in opposition to the strong feeling of the great body of founders of Church-schools in favour of this particular form of management, manifested by its general adoption when their liberty in this respect was unrestrained, it ought, I think, to be resisted. But this cannot be urged. The records of the National Society prove that it has been adopted far less frequently than others by promoters of schools aided by them. It must then be admitted that forms of management in which laymen are joined with the clergyman have to a considerably greater extent the sanction of Church practice than those from which they are excluded. And it certainly does seem to be more in accordance with Church principle to make provision for regulating the authority of laymen in a matter like this, than for excluding them altogether.

But granting that since this form of management has the sanction of the Church, and under certain circumstances may appear to be the most advantageous to the interests of the school, the Church might claim that it should not be excluded from those which the Committee of Council will accept, is it well to press this claim? Is it a matter of practical wisdom to join issue with the Government

on a point as to which we are divided among ourselves, whilst we might join issue (1) on the general principle involved in the question of the imposition of management clauses by the Committee of Council, and (2) on its practical denial on points on which we are agreed. I think that there can be no doubt that this course is most unwise, and most injurious to the interests of the Church.

It seems to me to be too much forgotten that the question is not, what are the conditions on which the Church shall grant aid to the founders of schools, but what are the best conditions on which we can obtain aid from those who administer the public money granted for this purpose. Our first endeavour should surely be, not to obtain the withdrawal of a condition which some may feel as a restraint on their freedom of choice, but full liberty for all to make such provision in the trust-deeds of their schools as are essential to the interests of Church education. Particular school founders may well be content to give up the absolute freedom of choice, if the fullest security be obtained for the management of our schools and the training of our children according to the principles of our Church. It may be a good oratorical position to say, 'We fight for full and unrestricted liberty to school-founders in the constitution of their trust-deeds: we will be content with nothing short of this.' But practically and on principle it is a bad one. For whilst men are thus protesting against acquiescing in the

least restriction on the liberty of school-founders, though that restriction should not be inconsistent with the principles and best interests of the Church, in hundreds of parishes men are driven by their necessities to accept unwillingly the present defective management clauses, and their schools made liable in perpetuity to all the evils incident to the want of some additional provision for the religious government of the school.

I have said, my Lord, that one of the chief reasons which caused the School Inspectors of this diocese to agree in disapproving one of the resolutions which Archdeacon Denison has given notice of his intention to bring forward at the next General Meeting of the National Society, was this ; that it did not fully express, or fairly involve, the principle, really at issue between the Government and the Church, with reference to the compulsory imposition of certain management clauses, A, B, C, D. The fact is, that the only principle, on which I believe the opposition of the Church to the enforcement of these clauses can fairly rest, has been ceded by Archdeacon Denison in the position which he now occupies. For while he earnestly claims for founders of Church schools the liberty to adopt a certain form of management clause, called E, he professes his willingness to allow clauses A, B, C, D, to remain as they are, unaltered, unmodified, except by the insertion of a provision that the master or mistress of a Church school should be a

communicant, though he believes that they would remain after this alteration still full of most objectionable points. It is obvious, that the principle of the course pursued by the Committee of Privy Council, would be precisely the same, if they were to enforce the adoption of one of the five clauses A, B, C, D, E, on all school founders, instead of one of the four, A, B, C, D, so long as four of the five were unsanctioned by the Church, and were considered to be open to grave objection, and the fifth was held by the majority of school founders to be practically more undesirable. According to the position now maintained by Archdeacon Denison, it is granted by implication, that the Privy Council Committee may enforce on a large class of school-founders the adoption of certain forms of management, which have not the sanction of the Church, and to which they are with good reason opposed, provided another section of school-founders are allowed to adopt a form which they consider to be the best. It is confessed that the larger part of school-founders would not agree to adopt the proposed clause E, and therefore their position would remain practically unaltered were the claim so earnestly contended for to be conceded. Those, who join with Archdeacon Denison in the position which he now maintains, are then not really battling for the Church at large and her best interests, nor for the definite principle at issue—that it does not belong to the Committee of the Privy Council to determine arbitrarily the form

of management which school founders shall adopt, if aided by the public money—but simply for liberty for a particular class of school-founders, and one which they admit to be comparatively a small one, to adopt a particular form of trust-deed.

I believe, my Lord, that the rejection of a claim like this urged in this way, is the first and most necessary step to be taken, in order to the satisfactory issue of the Church's present controversy with the State. I earnestly hope that men who are most anxious for the sound religious training of the children of the Church, not in this or that particular parish, but in this whole realm of England, in which Christ has planted her as the guardian of His truth, and the protectress of His little ones, will not commit themselves to a position, which both cedes an important principle, and is practically most injurious to the Church's interests. The grievance of late, and still, so loudly complained of,—the enforced union of some of the laity of the Church with the clergy in the management of a parochial school,—is assuredly not a real evil which we should unite to resist. The claim which is pressed so zealously—to be allowed to reject this enforced condition—is not assuredly the real remedy for the grievance of which the Church complains. If granted, it would confessedly leave the character of the present management clause system, so far as the large majority of school founders are concerned, unaltered. While the way in which it has been urged has

given, and still gives, a very wrong idea of the grievances of which the Church has just cause to complain. It is impossible, but that the placing in the fore-front of the Church's grievances with reference to the manner in which the Education Grant has been dispensed, the complaint, that founders of schools are not aided, if they wish to vest their management in the clergyman solely, should give an impression generally, that the liberty most earnestly desired by Churchmen is that of excluding by the trust-deeds the laity of the Church from all share as of right in their management. Those who contend so zealously for this liberty deny, that *they* have any such wish, and this denial will of course be fully accepted. But the fact remains, that they are contending most earnestly, as for a point of the utmost importance, for liberty for Churchmen generally to insert in the trust-deeds of their schools a clause, the sole *legal* effect of which is the exclusion of the laity from a *right* to take part in their management. Why is it that while we labour under a very real grievance, and suffer a real injustice, year after year the nation and the legislature listen more and more impatiently to our claims? Why, but that Churchmen have suffered themselves unconsciously to follow a wrong leading, instead of taking their ground upon a clear broad principle on which the whole Church might unite, and urging its concession in a calm considerate spirit, and in a tone moderate as well as firm.

But to reject this proposed resolution of Archdeacon Denison, which both incorrectly represents the grievance that is felt by the Church generally in the compulsory imposition of management clauses, and also cedes the principle really at issue, would not of itself place the Church, so far as it is represented by the National Society, in a satisfactory position. The proceedings of the General Meeting of last year seem to make necessary the affirmation of some broad principle on which the Church desires that the Committee of the National Society should re-open negotiations with the Committee of Privy Council. And I think that some such vote might be passed unanimously. For surely, my Lord, this is no party question. I do not see why men of one school may not join heartily with those of another, at least in the broad claim, that the management clauses, which are enforced by the Committee of Privy Council on promoters of Church schools, should have first received the approval or sanction of the Church as containing all that is essential for the full maintenance of her principles. And further, I think, that Churchmen of all schools might concur in the expression of an earnest desire,

First, that terms might be found on which the Church and State might co-operate heartily in the education of the people.

Secondly, that in the hope of obtaining this important end, the Committee of the National Society would re-open negotiations with the Committee of

Privy Council, for the purpose of effecting a satisfactory arrangement with reference to the conditions on which the promoters of Church schools should be allowed to participate in the grants voted by Parliament for national education.

Thirdly, that this negotiation should proceed on the principle, that no management clauses should be imposed on the founders of Church schools, which do not in the judgment of the Church, as expressed by the National Society, afford the fullest security for the sound religious education of her children on their own principles.

And lastly, that in order that this arrangement might be satisfactory to the promoters of Church schools generally, the following provisions among others hitherto excluded by the Committee of Council, should be allowed in the trust-deeds.

1. A power to be granted to the clergyman of the parish to suspend, or dismiss, with the sanction of the Bishop, the master or mistress on moral or religious grounds.

2. An appeal to the Bishop of the diocese, on all questions affecting morals or religion.

3. Power to be granted to the Bishop of the diocese, to decide whether a question is one of religion or morals.

4. Power to require the master or mistress to be communicants.

Different persons will of course entertain different opinions as to the importance of these provisions.

Possibly some may think them undesirable,—some unimportant. But I suppose that the large majority of Churchmen, practically interested in education, would consider one, or other, if not all of them, of the deepest importance to the satisfactory working of a Church school. I believe the Board of Education of this diocese were unanimous in this opinion. And clearly, the claim to be allowed to insert them, or some of them, in the trust-deeds of a Church school, is in no way open to the objections to which the claim for the adoption of clause E. is liable. They are most strictly in harmony with the theory and practice of our Church, and whilst they afford the fullest security for the preservation of her doctrine, and the moral and religious training of her children, they can give no ground for the suspicion, that the clergy are jealous of lay influence in the school.

The first I hold to be a valuable provision against possible evils of the most serious kind. It might often happen, that the lay coadjutors of the clergyman in the management of a school would be less keenly alive to the deep importance of religious and moral qualifications in the master or mistress, than he, whose especial office it is, to watch over the moral and religious interests of others. Their judgment would commonly be more biassed by other considerations. At times, influenced by the general excellence of the master intellectually, and as a teacher,—more frequently perhaps by kindly feelings towards the man,—they might be disposed,

and might think it their duty were they invested with the responsibility of determining the point, to retain him in his office against the wishes of the clergyman, because his fault did not seem to them great enough to be punished with dismissal. And for a clergyman to know, that one, who should be his coadjutor in a most important part of his office—the care and training of the little ones of his flock—was unsound in doctrine, or of moral habits such as he was accustomed in his ordinary pastoral teaching to condemn, and to be unable to remove him, would be a most serious injury to the general welfare of the parish. The existence of habits or views clearly inconsistent with a high tone of religion, or the purest morals, in one in the position of master or mistress of a parish school, is plainly so deadly an evil, that the fullest provision should be made for its prevention. And therefore it is not unreasonable, nor in the least degree inconsistent with the just influence and authority of the lay members of the school committee, that, in the prevention of evils of this kind only, the single voice of the clergyman, if sanctioned by the Bishop, should be as effectual as that of the majority of the committee. The effect of this provision would be simply to establish a double security against a danger to which every school is liable,—the possession of the office of master or mistress by one who was unsound in doctrine, or of immoral habits. By this provision the majority of the Committee, and

the clergyman, would both, with the sanction of the Bishop, have equally the power to remove it, as soon as it was discovered.

The second of these provisions which I have specified as important, and which (if I may take the unanimity of the Diocesan Board of this diocese as indicating the general feeling), are commonly desired by members of our Church, is simply a moderate, but important and most reasonable enlargement of a power already granted, of making the Bishop of the diocese the final appeal in all matters of religion. To this I think no serious objection can be made by any.

The third is most necessary legally, in order to carry out the intention of the second, and to avoid endless litigation by appeal to the civil courts as to the jurisdiction of the Bishop.

The fourth is plainly in harmony with the whole theory of the Church, which regards the non-communicant as not a living member of her body, if by his own fault he has cut himself off from participation in the holy Sacrament. As one manifestly not living in accordance with the rules of the Church, the non-communicant seems to be clearly disqualified for the office of training her children in accordance with her principles. Many, it is true, have felt, that the insertion of a clause like this would be a serious evil, as possibly leading to the desecration of the most holy Sacrament by making it a legal qualification for a desired office. This is

a danger against which all possible precaution should be used by the terms in which the provision is expressed. But if it is plainly right in principle, we may and ought to claim liberty to adopt it, in the hope that possible ills in practice would be averted.

Now if these provisions are with good reason held to be of very deep importance by a large body of the Church, and if they are most consistent with every Church principle, and open to no serious practical objection, it is surely the part of brotherly love and charity that those who do not themselves feel their value, should yet unite in an endeavour to obtain for the Church generally the liberty of their adoption. If they cannot unite in this, at least they should not oppose the claim. And if, on the other hand, others consider the provisions which I have specified to be insufficient as not involving all that they wish to obtain, they may yet join in a claim which they believe at least to be good so far as it goes. To have joined in a claim for more than this, is no reason for opposing a claim for less. There is surely no inconsistency, in asking for that liberty only which is essential to the interests of the Church, though desiring more, and acquiescing in a restriction which the Church may fully sanction without the least abandonment of principle.

It is impossible to overrate the importance to the great interests of Church education at the present crisis of considering well and wisely the ground

which we ought to occupy in our relation to the State, and of moderation in the manner in which it is maintained. In order that the Church's just claim may be successfully urged, we need much the spirit of unity and charity; that, seeking to enter into and understand one another's views and feelings, we may be of one mind on all essential points; that, hoping all things and imputing no evil, we may, whilst battling for most just claims, be gentle and moderate as well as firm, in tone. If the Church should thus with united voice urge steadily and patiently the claims which she feels to be of deepest importance to the religious and moral welfare of her people, there is every ground for hope that she will now be heard with attention, and obtain what she asks. And if we should fail to obtain the end for which we strive, still if we labour in this spirit, not for ourselves but for others, we shall not fail to gain some good. A great and certain good would assuredly be won, if we could present to the people of this country the spectacle of a Church united at least in this one point,—a watchful care for the religious training of her children,—and urging with one voice her most just claim,—that the Church in this land shall not, as the condition of receiving aid from the State in the instruction of her people, be restrained from the adoption of such forms of management, and the insertion of such provision in the trust-deeds of her schools as shall in her judgment seem to be essential or im-

portant in securing their sound religious education in her own principles.

Great blessing it would be, my Lord, if in labouring for that cause in which the love of Christ may find its most fitting exercise,—the feeding of the lambs of His flock,—with common zeal though with too divided views, we may win from Him the grace and gifts we need especially,—charity and mutual love,—that union one with another in Him, which is the truest note that we are His, the most prevailing proof to an unbelieving world of His divinity and power who worketh in us.

I am, my dear Lord,

With much respect and regard,

Your Lordship's faithful servant,

ROBERT A. GORDON.

Avington Rectory,

April 29, 1852.

OXFORD :

PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.





